



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/772,477 | 01/29/2001 | Antonius Hendricus Maria Holtslag | NL 000025 US | 1648 |

24737 7590 09/12/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

NELSON, ALECIA DIANE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

MAILED

SEP 12 2006

Technology Center 2600

Application Number: 09/772,477
Filing Date: January 29, 2001
Appellant(s): HOLTSLAG ET AL.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

Koninklijk Philips Electronics
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/07/04.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 stand or fall together and that claims 4, 6, and 7 stand or fall alone.

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------|
| EP 0890941 | Wani | 1-1999 |
| 6018329 | Kida et al. | 1-2000 |
| 20010045924 | Huang | 11-2001 |
| 6448947 | Nagai | 9-2002 |
| 5508716 | Prince et al. | 8-1996 |

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:
Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 11/06/03.

(11) Response to Argument

With regard to the Appellant's argument (1) addressing the rejection as applied to **claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8** being patentable over Wani in view of Kida. It is argued that if the references were combinable the combination would result in a loss of resolution and/or sharpness. Wani teaches partial interlace scanning in the lower bits in order to reduce addressing time. Kida teaches addressing bits within the subframes, wherein neighboring lines are assigned the same

luminance value, in order to also reduce addressing time. Therefore it would have been obvious to allow the method of addressing neighboring lines with the same luminance as taught by Kida to be used in the system taught by Wani, which teaches addressing the lower bits in a manner to reduce the addressing time. By reducing the addressing time the sustaining periods will be increased and the brightness of the display is also increased. Further with reference to Wani teaching addressing neighboring lines simultaneously to the least significant bits, it would also be obvious to allow the usage of the method of Kida, which addresses neighboring lines with the same luminance value in successive frames or fields, for different regions of the display, or for different subfields as claimed. As explained above this thereby reduces address time, which in turn increase the sustaining period and increases the brightness of the display.

With regard to the Appellant's argument (2) addressing the rejection as applied to **claim 4** being patentable over Wani in view of Kida further in view of Huang. It is argued that Huang does not teach or suggest applying a common luminance value to lines of a set of scanning lines of at least one of the least significant subfields as claimed by Appellant's **claim 1**. However, as explained above this limitation is taught by the combination of Wani and Kida, and not intended to be taught by Huang. Kida teaches addressing neighboring lines with the same luminance value in successive frames or fields, different regions of the display, or different subfields of at least one of the least significant subfields as disclosed by Wani. **Claim 4** further limits **claim 1** by stating that the set of lines comprise sets of three lines. Huang teaches that the scanning lines can be

divided into three or more groups. Therefore Huang does teach the limitation of **claim 4** and thereby adds to the teachings of the combination of Wani and Kida.

With regard to the Appellant's argument (3) addressing the rejection as applied to **claim 6** being patentable over Wani in view of Kida and further in view of Nagai. It is argued that Nagai does not teach or suggest applying a common luminance value to lines of a set of scanning lines of at least one of the least significant subfields as claimed by Appellant's **claim 1**. However, as explained above this limitation is taught by the combination of Wani and Kida, and not intended to be taught by Huang. Kida teaches addressing neighboring lines with the same luminance value in successive frames or fields, different regions of the display, or different subfields of at least one of the least significant subfields as disclosed by Wani. **Claim 6** further limits **claim 1** by stating that the display device comprises a first region being the upper half of the display and a second region being the lower half of the display. Nagai teaches in Figure 12 display lines of an upper half group and a lower half group. Therefore Nagai does teach the limitation of **claim 6**, and thereby adds to the teachings of the combination of Wani and Kida.

With regard to the Appellant's argument (4) addressing the rejection as applied to **claim 7** being patentable over Wani in view of Kida and further in view of Prince. It is argued that Prince does not teach or suggest that the fields or frames are or may be divided into subfields or subframes of varying significance. However this is not claimed in **claim 7**. **Claim 7** further limits **claim 1** by stating that the grouping of the lines for each successive frame or field and for different


regions of the display device is performed in a random manner. Prince teaches that the number of row electrodes forming each group and the algorithm for changing the groupings of row electrodes in subsequent addressing cycles can be varied. Thus, Prince is relevant to the Appellant's claimed invention used in combination with Wani and Kida in disclosing the limitations of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,
Examiner Alecia D. Nelson

adn/ADN
November 12, 2004

Conferees
Michael Razavi 
Bipin Shalwala 

Philips Electronics North American Corp
580 White Plains Rd.
Tarrytown, NY 10591



AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER